

MR2849-38

Appl. No. 10/606,785

Reply to Office Action dated 12/12/2006

REMARKS

This case has been reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 12 December 2005. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Office Action, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the Subject Patent Application, and Claims 5, 7, 11, 12, and 13 have been amended to change the dependency thereof. Claim 3, 4, 10 and 15 - 21 are cancelled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 4 - 8, as being in improper dependent form. In particular, Claim 4 was a multiple dependent claim that did not state the claims from which it depends in the alternative. As Claim 4 is now cancelled, the subject matter thereof incorporated in Claim 1, it is believed that the Examiner's objection is now moot.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Manley et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,435,436. Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Gunther, U.S. Patent No. 3,575,007, and Claims 1, 3, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Pagini, U.S. Patent No. 3,961,658. Additionally, Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pagini in view of Schlesinger et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,441,606. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 10 - 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

MR2849-38

Appl. No. 10/606,785

Reply to Office Action dated 12/12/2006

Accordingly, Claims 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 10 therein. Thus, Claim 10 has effectively been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 9, and any intervening claims, which there were none. Thus, Claim 9 and the claims dependant thereon should now be allowable. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 3 and 4 therein. As there was no "art" rejection of claim 4 and it is not believed that the cited prior art discloses or suggests the now claimed combination, Claim 1 and the Claims dependent thereon should now be allowable.

It is now believed that the subject patent application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein

Registration No. 33,253

Dated: 10 March 2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
Tel: 410-465-6678
Customer No. 04586